

創価大学  
国際仏教学高等研究所  
年 報

平成17年度  
(第9号)

Annual Report  
of  
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
at Soka University  
for the Academic Year 2005

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所  
東京・2006・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
Soka University  
Tokyo・2006

# Everyday Life in an Ancient Indian Buddhist Monastery\*

Oskar von HINÜBER

Everyday life in medieval European Christian monasteries is well known, partly by a well documented literary tradition partly by extant buildings and their inventory, sometimes even in use today. Moreover, numerous monasteries converted into museums allow immediate access to this particular aspect of culture for any one interested.

In stark contrast, no Buddhist monastery from ancient India survives intact. Once large and famous buildings such as Nālandā lie in ruins. Only the results of excavations executed during the early 20<sup>th</sup> century in campaigns between 1915 and 1925 and later<sup>1</sup> are on view. For, as it is well known, when Buddhism vanished from North India during the 13<sup>th</sup> century and only centuries later, also from the South<sup>2</sup>, monasteries were deserted and eventually fell into decay. Buddhist monks and laity disappeared from Indian culture.

Once the physical presence of Buddhism is lost in India, turning to other countries in the immediate vicinity, where Buddhism is a living religion today, such as South-East Asia or Ceylon, may be more promising and ample evidence of Buddhist monasteries still in use is certainly found. However, this evidence is fairly “modern” compared to a really old Buddhist tradition in India proper near in time to the early days of Buddhism and of the Buddha himself. Consequently, it is difficult, if not impossible to tell, how far the daily life observed here represents more than at best a very distant echo from ancient Indian times.

Therefore, if we wish to find out, how Buddhist monks might have lived in pre-muslim India, if not even earlier during the time of the first Buddhist millennium, immediate observation does not help, and we have to turn indirect evidence found in a variety of sources such as literature, not at all composed to satisfy our particular curiosity. For, as it often happens, we are asking questions, which the rich Buddhist literature, extant in spite of heavy losses of texts, never was meant to answer. Therefore, it is much

---

\* This text is based on a lecture given at Soka University on 9<sup>th</sup> September 2004 and elsewhere, and, consequently, greatly profited from the subsequent discussions. — All abbreviations used follow the system of the Critical Pāli Dictionary (Epilegomena to Vol. I, 1948 supplemented in Vol. III/1. 1992 and III/8. 2001).

<sup>1</sup> H. D. Sankalia: *The Nālandā University*. Delhi <sup>2</sup>1972, p. 249.

<sup>2</sup> See note 61 below.

easier to find information on philosophical problems, meditation or various aspects of spirituality, than on daily life. Even the rich narrative literature is not much concerned with the life of Buddhist monks inside or outside the monastery. The only exception, of course, is the equally rich Vinaya literature, which, however, describes the norm rather than real life, but allows precious insights into certain aspects of the life of a Buddhist monks, once it is read against its original intention<sup>3</sup>.

When turning from literary evidence to other monuments, it is of course possible to find paintings and sculptures depicting monks, buildings and scenes from monastic life. Old paintings, however, with the notable exception of Ajaṇṭā<sup>4</sup>, are found in Central Asia, and are, consequently, often influenced by non-Indian cultures. Moreover, they were created not only far away from the original home, but also during a time remote from the earlier periods of Buddhism. The latter is true of course already for Ajaṇṭā<sup>5</sup>. Only stone sculptures would allow an immediate look at really old monastic life, but this subject does not figure prominently in Buddhist art.

It is, therefore, evident already from this very superficial survey of early or comparatively early sources that it does require a certain amount of effort to collect material the available literature in form of books and inscriptions, from the monuments and from archaeological finds. Still, when different sources are carefully sifted and combined, it is not impossible to extract some details on daily life and to gather information which they were never meant to convey.

Luckily, there are some, if rare contemporary witnesses, who saw and even lived in ancient Indian Buddhist monasteries, although it was not their primary interest to describe monastic life. Chinese pilgrims in India, first of all Yi-jing (I-tsing) and Xuan zang (Hsüan-tsang), stayed in monasteries and mention precious details of monastic life and organisation. Again, these invaluable reports reflect a time long after the Buddha.

Given all these limitation of our sources it is hardly surprising that it turns out to be fairly difficult to find answers to some very simple questions: What did a Buddhist monk look like during the time of the Buddha or during the following centuries? How did he wear his robes, and what was the actual shape of his equipment as mentioned in the texts? Under which circumstances did Buddhist monks live, and how did they behave

---

<sup>3</sup> In the recent past the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins has used very successfully for studies of this kind by G. Schopen, many of whose articles are collected now in the three volumes "Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks. Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India"; "Buddhist Monks and Business Matters. Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India". Honolulu 1997 and "Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India. More collected Papers". Honolulu 2005.

<sup>4</sup> According to the survey in D. Schlingloff: *Ajanta. Handbuch der Malereien. 1: Erzählende Wandmalereien* Vol. II. Supplement. Wiesbaden 2000, p. 106ff. "Inventory of Pictorial Elements", no scenes from a monastery can be seen on the paintings; only monks and nuns are rarely shown: no. 18, P. 124.

<sup>5</sup> The date is discussed by Walter Spink: *The Innocent Evolution of Ajanta's technology*. In: H. Bakker [Ed.]: *The Vākāṭaka Heritage. Indian Culture at the Crossroads*. Groningen 2004, p. 87-105 and in many earlier articles.

towards each other in private, that is, when they were not participating in an official legal act or fighting a Vinaya case? — Lawsuits are at least briefly outlined in the relevant texts. — How were the monasteries furnished? How were they kept in good repair? How did the administration of large monastic complexes such as Nālandā work<sup>6</sup>, and where exactly did the financial means come from to keep the monastery up? For, as Yi-jing says, as many as 3000 or 3500, if not 5000 monks were accommodated in Nālandā – the text and consequently the figures are unfortunately unclear<sup>7</sup>. In addition, many laymen lived or were present in this and other monasteries as servants to the monks or as students of Nālandā university.

How, then, might Buddhist monks have looked during the beginning of first Buddhist millennium except from the fact that they had, of course, shaven heads<sup>8</sup>? Obviously, there is neither direct evidence nor any tradition of the appearance of any individual monk during the life time of the Buddha. This statement concerning Buddhist monks fits uncomfortably well into the larger frame of ancient Indian culture. For, extremely little historical information on individual persons survives from early India. The dates, as it is well known, even of highly prominent and important persons such as the Buddha himself are rather doubtful<sup>9</sup>, but at least his life span is mentioned, if only in one reference in the Mahāparinibbānasuttanta<sup>10</sup>. The second person, whose age at the time of his death survives, is the archrival of the Buddha, Mahāvira, the founder of Jainism, who died at the age of 72<sup>11</sup>. It seems that these two are in fact the only life times known from ancient India well into the first millennium A.D., which could be considered as historical<sup>12</sup>.

There are, of course, unhistorical life spans, obviously without any relation to reality, such as those concerning kings mentioned in the Purāṇas or disciples and other persons living at the time of the Buddha, and in fact living much longer than he did:

---

<sup>6</sup> The administration of Buddhist monasteries is addressed in the forthcoming book by Jonathan Silk: *Managing Monks. Administration and Administrative Roles in Ancient Indian Buddhist Monasticism*.

<sup>7</sup> A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671-695) by I-Tsing trsl. by J. Takakusu. London 1896 (Repr. Delhi 1966), p. 154.

<sup>8</sup> This, however, would not necessarily distinguish a Buddhist monk from other ascetics such as Jainas. The terminology used for removing hair and beard is discussed by N. Balbir: *Lā- et Lau- en moyen-indien: emplois technique et morphologie*, in: *Langue, style et structure dans le monde indien*. Centenaire de Louis Renou. Paris 1996, p. 327-352.

<sup>9</sup> For the pertinent discussion see H. Bechert: *Die Datierung des historischen Buddha*. *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Dritte Folge* I (Nr. 189, 1991), II (Nr. 194, 1992), III (Nr. 222, 1997).

<sup>10</sup> *asītiko me vayo vattati*, DN II 100, 12; cf. on the different periods in the historical Buddha's life: *ekūnatimso vayasā Subbadda / yaṃ pabbajim kimkusalanuesī / vassāni paññāsasamādhikāni / yato abam pabajjito Subbadda*, DN II 151, 12\*-29\*.

<sup>11</sup> W. Schubring: *Die Lehre der Jainas nach den alten Quellen dargestellt*. Berlin und Leipzig 1935 § 19.

<sup>12</sup> Khāravala mentions his age in his inscription: He was 24, when he became king (line 2) and, consequently, 37 when he wrote the inscription during or after the completion of his 13<sup>th</sup> year as king (line 14). The length of his life, however, remains unknown.

Visākhā lives 120 years, four brahmins, Ānanda, Mahākassapa and Anuruddha lived each up to 150, and finally Bakkula as the most healthy of all monks even reached 160 years<sup>13</sup>. It is only the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī<sup>14</sup>, which adds these life times of the disciples in the explanation of the Mahāpadānasuttanta, where the enormous life times of the six predecessors of the Buddha in our Bhadrakalpa are discussed, and, where in contrast, the Buddha states modestly: *mayhaṇi ... appakaṇi āyuppaṃāṇaṇi parittaṇi labusaṇi, yo ciraṇi jīvati so vassasatam appaṇi vā bhiyyo*, DN II 4, 4 “Small is my lifespan, modest, insignificant. Who lives a long life, lives hundred years or a little more”.

Equally unknown are the features of any Indian individual living ancient India. One of the first attempts to ascribe a picture to a specific person is the well-known relief from Bharhut, where the presence of Anāthapiṇḍika is indicated by an inscription<sup>15</sup>. Similarly, a person is defined Aśoka by an inscription on a relief recently found in Kanaganahalli<sup>16</sup>. In later times, the statues of Śātavāhana or Kuṣāṇa rulers follow the same pattern of defining whose portrait is depicted<sup>17</sup>. The first real portraits intending to show the real features of individuals are found on the Indo-Greek coins in India. For, in contrast to India, there was already a long tradition of preparing portraits in classical antiquity.

Although no individual is depicted as such during the early centuries of Buddhism, we do see many anonymous persons on numerous reliefs with the notable exception of Buddhist monks. Only after Buddhism existed for about half a millennium, a monk is shown for the first time on a coin, the Buddha himself<sup>18</sup>. Again, it is only the accompanying inscription “BOΔΔO” which identifies the monk. And it is remarkable that it was obviously felt necessary to point out to Greeks or Kuṣāṇas that is to those who used and read

<sup>13</sup> Cf. O. v. Hinüber: Old age and old monks in Pāli Buddhism, in: Aging. Asian Concepts and Experiences Past and Present, edited by Susanne Formanek and Sepp Linhart. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 643. Band, Wien 1997, p. 65-78 and R. A. Ray: Nāgārjuna's Longevity, in: J. Schober [Ed.]: Sacred Biography in the Buddhist Traditions of South and Southeast Asia. Honolulu 1997, p. 129-159.

<sup>14</sup> Sv 413, 14-20.

<sup>15</sup> A. K. Coomaraswamy: La sculpture de Bharhut. Annales du Musée Guimet. Bibliothèque d'art. Nouvelle série: VI. Paris 1956, planche XXVI, fig. 67.

<sup>16</sup> Indian Archaeology 1998/9 [2004], p. 66 and plate on the cover of the issue, where the Brāhmī inscription *asoko rājā* is clearly readable. The supposed “portrait” of Aśoka published in the Newsletter 13, Circle of Inner Asian Art, School of Oriental and African Studies in 2001, p. 15 as based on a grossly wrong reading; moreover, *rājā asoka* would be Sanskrit in a supposedly pre-Christian inscription!

<sup>17</sup> On “portraits” in ancient India: O. v. Hinüber. Die Palola Śāhis. Ihre Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzzauber. Materialien zur Geschichte von Gilgit und Chilas. Antiquities of Northern Pakistan. Reports and Studies Vol. 5. Mainz 2004, p. 170 sq., where references to Padma Kaimal: The problem of portrait in South India ca. 970-1000 A.D. *Artibus Asiae* 59. 1999, p. 59-133; 60. 2000, p. 139-179 and Ph. Granoff: Portraits, Likenesses and Looking Glasses: Some Literary and Philosophical Reflections on Representation and Art in Medieval India, in: Representation in Religion ed. by J. Assmann and A. I. Baumgarten. Numen Book Series. Studies in the History of Religions Vol. LXXXIX. Leiden 2001, p. 63-105 should be added.

<sup>18</sup> Therefore, the head is not shaven.

Greek script that the monk was meant to represent the Buddha. In later times, no such hint was necessary and consequently there is no parallel to this inscription. During early Kuṣāṇa times, however, nobody could be expected to know who was shown on the coin at a time, when iconography still awaited definition and development, and when neither the Buddha nor Buddhist monks were ever portrayed previously on coins or in reliefs.

If there is no immediate evidence for the appearance of monks during the times near to the beginnings of Buddhism or even during the first centuries of its development, that can be gathered from extant Buddhist art — of course we do not have and consequently do not know, if there were perhaps some early paintings of monks, which, given the evidence available, does not seem likely — we have to turn to texts, if we wish to imagine the appearance of any very early Buddhist monk. Here at least the robes of Buddhist monks are defined in the Vinaya texts, if in a paragraph, which is by no means easily understood: “Then, after having stayed at Rajagaha for as long as he felt agreeable, the Lord proceeded to Dakkhiṇāgiri. The Lord saw a field typical for Magadha, laid out in squares (*accibaddha*)<sup>19</sup>, laid out by dams (*pālibaddha*), laid out by embankments (*ṇariyādabaddha*), laid out by crossroads (*siṅghāṭakabaddha*). Having seen it, he addressed Ānanda: ‘Do you see, Ānanda, this field typical for Magadha ... limited by cross-roads?’ ‘Yes, Lord’ ‘Are you able, Ānanda, to prepare robes like that for the monks?’” Of course Ānanda answers in the positive, and produces robes which are described in the text as follows: “And Ānanda is going to make a seam (*kusi*), he is going to make half a seam (*aḍḍhakusi*), he is going to make a (large square) piece (*maṇḍala*), he is going to make half a (square) piece (*aḍḍhamāṇḍala*), he is going to make a piece in the middle (*vivaṭṭa*), he is going to make a piece at the sides (*anuvivaṭṭa*), he is going to make a neck-piece (*gīṭveyyaka*), he is going to make a calves-piece (*jaṅgheyyaka*)<sup>20</sup>, he is going to make an outer end (*bāhanta*). And the robe will consist of cut (pieces: *chinnaka*), and will be shoddy, appropriate for an ascetic and unattractive for anyone desiring to have a robe”, Vin I 287, 6-27<sup>21</sup>.

After reading this text in Pāli or in translation, it is by no means easy to imagine

<sup>19</sup> So read, Ec *bandha*. The Samantapāsādikā 1127, 4-9 explains this paragraph as follows: “Laid out in squares (read *accibaddha*): a rice field laid out in squares; laid out by dams: laid out in width and in length by long embankments; laid out by embankments: laid out inside (a field) by short embankments (read with Bp *rassamariyādabaddha* and cf. note 64 below); laid out by crossroads: laid out by crossroads in crossing embankment by embankment at the place from where (the crossroads) start (? read *gataṭṭhāne* with Bp?), a meeting point of four (embankments)”. The translation, and particularly *acci*°, remains doubtful in many details.

<sup>20</sup> According to the commentary, an extra strip of cloth is attached to the robe to strengthen the parts touching the neck and the calves.

<sup>21</sup> The robes of the Buddha or of Kassapa are described in general terms only, when they exchange their clothes: SN II 221, 10-21 *mudukā ... paṭapilotikānaṃ saṅghāṭi* (of Kassapa) “soft cloak of pieces of cloth” — *sāṇāni paṇṣukūlāni nibbasanāni* (of the Buddha) “coarse, worn out rags from the dust heap”. On the meaning of this paragraph: M. Deeg: Das Ende des Dharma und die Ankunft des Maitreya. End- und Neue-Zeit-Vorstellungen im Buddhismus mit einem Exkurs zur Kāśyapa-Legende. ZfR 7. 1999, p. 145-169, part. p. 164, note 64 and J. Silk: Dressed for Success. The Monk Kāśyapa and Strategies of Legitimation in Earlier Mahāyāna Buddhist Scriptures. JAs 291. 2003, pp. 173-219, particularly p. 182ff., and now also A. Seidel: Den'e, in: Hōbōgirin VIII. 2003.

either field or robe, because the meaning of the most likely technical vocabulary used here has been lost. No difficulty, however, was felt by the author of this text who had a visual perception of the objects, which he described. Moreover, this text was composed for early monks, who most likely were well acquainted even with the agricultural terminology used in Magadha and much more so with the robes they themselves were wearing. This, however, is true only for fairly early times, when Buddhism was still based in or near to Magadha. For, although the author(s) of the *Mūlasarvāstivādin* continued to know and to follow the tradition that the model for the robes was a field in Magadha, they phrased the text in their Vinaya quite differently: “(The Buddha with Ānanda) disappeared in Rājagṛha and stood on the mountain Vaidehika<sup>22</sup>. At that time, when he saw the fields of the people living in Magadha, which were regular (*sama*), with regular precincts (*saṃopavicāra*), laid out in rows (*āvalīvinibaddha*<sup>23</sup>), manifold by preparing plots (*bbhaktīracanāviśeṣavicitra*), he again addressed Ānanda ...”, *Cīvaravastu*, GM III 2, p. 50, 7, 12. Obviously, the older middle Indic version was no longer understood, and the author(s) of the *Mūlasarvāstivādin* Vinaya, who may have experienced almost the same difficulties as the author of the *Samantapāsādikā*, who in fifth century Ceylon did the obvious in shaping his explanation after the robes he knew.

The difficulties of both these authors are shared by modern readers who also lack a clear understanding of the fields in Magadha, or in general terms, are unable to connect the statements made in the texts to the reality of the times they reflect. What is evidently needed is the visual evidence, which tells us how monks’ robes looked in ancient India. Of course there is ample evidence again from paintings in Central Asia, but, in this particular case by lucky coincidence evidence from India is even much older. For a robe of perhaps even a Buddhist monk can be seen in one of the reliefs on the railings of the stūpa at Bharhut. The picture shows a robe hanging from a tree and being “milked” by a crouching man<sup>24</sup>. The accompanying inscription says: *V[e]ḍuko katha dohati naḍode pavate* “Veḍuka milks the ascetic’s robe on the mounain Naḍoda”. As H. Lüders has already recognized, the word *katha* in the inscription corresponds to *kanthā* “garment of religious mendicants”, which is, as Lüders demonstrates from Sanskrit literature, patched together. He also draws attention to the passage from the Theravāda Vinaya quoted above.

Although the Buddhists of course do not use the term *kanthā*, but *cīvara* for their robes, and although the *kanthā* as seen in Bharhut has four widths compared with the always uneven numbers of monks’ robes with five, seven, nine or eleven widths<sup>25</sup>, it is

<sup>22</sup> Looking down from a mountain is a *topos* used already in a comparison in the *Majjhimanikāya*: MN III 130, 23–33.

<sup>23</sup> Thus GM III 2, 10, 12; the text is corrupt in GM III 2, 10 = FE 6, 151/814, line 2 reading *ālinīvinivaddhāni*.

<sup>24</sup> Coomaraswamy: La sculpture de Bharhut, as note 15 above, plate XLV, fig. 178. The inscription is discussed by H. Lüders: *Bharhut Inscriptions*, revised by E. Waldschmidt and M. A. Mehendale. *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* Vol. II, 2 Ootacamund 1963, no. B 73, p. 169.

<sup>25</sup> O. v. Hinüber: Eine Karmavācānā-Sammlung aus Gilgit. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen*

still fairly easy to recognize on the relief all the more important parts of the robe as described in the Theravāda Vinayapiṭaka with the *maṇḍalas* and *aḍḍhamaṇḍalas* separated by seems as the fields are either by dams or by embankments. The fairly characteristic arrangement of the individual parts of both robes, the one described in the Theravādavīnaya and the one seen in Bharhut, seems to allow the conclusion that Veḍuka has before him a garment which looks like a Buddhist monk's robe. This assumption can be supported by the sculpture of a Bodhisatva from Mathurā donated most likely by Nāgadina<sup>26</sup>. This Bodhisatva wears a robe with divisions similar to those visible at Bharhut. Moreover, modern evidence can be compared. For even today Theravāda monks are using robes patched together according to the same method of distributing the same number of large and small squares separated by clearly visible seems. The evidence from ancient Central Asia, however, unsurprisingly differs, because the monks were of course not Theravādins following the tradition of the Mahāvihāra at Anurādhapura. Therefore, the number of widths is neither the same as prescribed in the Theravādavīnaya nor as seen in Bharhut.

In spite of the fact that the shape of a robe can be established by combining textual and visual evidence, one important detail is still missing, that is the colour. Here, the grey stone does not help, and again paintings from Central Asia show a large variety of colours, occasionally even shades of green. The colour of the robes of monks painted in Ajaṇṭā, on the other hand, seems to have faded. Therefore it is uncertain how far this light colour reflects the original intention of the painter. Moreover, the variety of colours used for monks robes used in present day Theravāda is considerable. Besides the standard yellow, darkish brown, rarely also red robes can be seen in present day Thailand.

Again the texts prescribe of course the standard colour and the Chinese pilgrim Yi-jing tells his fellow monks in China to use a shade of yellow "not too deep nor too light"<sup>27</sup>. In a Sanskrit drama composed in South India roughly at the time when Yi-jing visited India, the Mattavilāsa by Mahendravikramavarman, a Kapālika states:

*yad etad āsīt prathamaṃ svabhāvato  
mṛṇālabhaṇḍagacchavīcoraṃ ambaram  
nanu tvayā nītaṃ acintyakarmaṇā  
tad eva bālāruṇarāgatāmratām* (verse 15)

"The garment that was by nature first surpassing the colour of a lotus fibre (i. e. white), was certainly transformed by your inconceivable action into the copper colour of the early morning sun".

In the next verse, the Kapālika mentions also *kaṣāya anapāyīn* "unperishable yellow", the

Gesellschaft 119. 1969, p. 102-132, particularly p. 109.

<sup>26</sup> The number of widths of the garment seen in this sculpture cannot be ascertained, because the Bodhisatva is sitting. However, the number seems to be different from the one usual in the Theravāda tradition. The sculpture was published by T. N Ramachandran: An inscribed Bodhisattva image from Mathura. Ancient India 6. 1950. p. 100-102, plates XXXVIII, XXXIX.



same word used in Pāli for the colour of robes<sup>28</sup>. Similarly, at the beginning of act VIII of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*, a monk says in Māgadhī<sup>29</sup>: *gibidakaśāodae aśe cīvale* “This robe has taken the yellow colour”. Whatever shade of colour *kāsāya* / *kasāva* may have noted exactly, the colour was certainly not white, the colour of householders, and it was an ugly colour, because the Buddha emphasized that Ānanda should create ugly and unattractive robes.

Thus composition and colour of the Buddhist monk’s robe emerge from texts and pictures, ancient and modern. As these garments were quite different from those worn by laymen, who wrapped themselves in unsewn white clothes as long as they did not belong to those miserable poor<sup>30</sup>, who had to wear anything, the Buddhists had to prepare their robes themselves, that is dye them and, first of all, sew them. All this is prescribed in the highly technical and not yet fully understood chapters of the Vinayas on the prescriptions concerning the Kaṭhina ceremony<sup>31</sup>. These rules will not be discussed here when looking for texts mentioning monks actually being involved in the act of tailoring their clothes. This is described in some detail in the *Samantapāsādikā* quoting from the *Kurundī*, when explaining the Pācittiya rule on *gaṇabbhojana*, in which *cīvare kayiramāne*, Vin IV 74, 37 “when a robe is being made” occurs:

*Kurundiyaṃ pana vitthāren’ eva vuttam: yo cīvaraṃ vicāreti, chindati, moghasuttaṃ saṇṭhapeti, āgantukapaṭṭaṃ ṭhapeti, paccāgataṃ sibbeti, āgantukapaṭṭaṃ bandhati; anuvātaṃ chindati, ghaṭṭeti, āropeti; tathā paccāgataṃ sibbati; suttaṃ karoti, valeti; pipphalikaṃ niseti; parivattanaṃ karoti; sabbo pi cīvaraṃ karoti yevā ti vuccati. yo pana samīpe nisinno jātakaṃ vā dhammapadaṃ katheti, ayaṃ na cīvarakārako, Sp 813, 7-14*

“In the *Kurundī*, however, it stated in great detail: ‘Who measures<sup>32</sup> (and) cuts the cloth, makes marks (for sewing)<sup>33</sup>, fixes (*ṭhapeti*) a patch<sup>34</sup>, sews a hem<sup>35</sup>,

<sup>27</sup> A Record of the Buddhist Religion, as note 7 above, p. 77.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. CPD s. vv. *kasāya* and *kasāva* and NPED s.v. *kāsāya*.

<sup>29</sup> On this verse see O. v. Hinüber: Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit, in: Dialectes dans les Littératures Indo-Aryennes, ed. par C. Caillat. Paris 1989, p. 341-367, particularly p. 449, note 23 and note that on this pages two lines are missing: after “... verses extant in Māgadhī.” insert: “The dramas thus mirror the well known linguistic situation that the Buddhists adhering to different schools speak different languages such /p. 350/ as Māgadhī and Sanskrit ...”.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. W. Rau: The vagrant and the poor in Sanskrit poetry. ABORI 72/73. 1991 & 1992, p. 23-34 and the review of Klaus Wille: Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden. Teil 9 [Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band X, 9]. Stuttgart 2004, IJ (forthcoming) on “Wiedergeburt Ib”.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. CPD s. v. *kaṭhina*.

<sup>32</sup> *vicāretīti pañcakhaṇḍādivasena samvidabati*, Sp-ṭ III 55, 16 “measures means: he arranges by the five pieces (of an *antaravāsa*) etc.”

<sup>33</sup> According to the *Samantapāsādikā*, the marks to guide subsequent sewing are made almost as in present times by tailor’s chalk: *moghasuttakan ti* (Vin II 116, 22) *vaḍḍhakīṇaṃ dārūsu kālasuttana viya baliddisuttana saññākaraṇaṃ*, Sp 1206, 24 “making a mark by a turmeric thread as by the black thread of carpenters”. Turmeric is used because of the yellow colour and because it fades away quickly. Vajirabuddhi, however, is of a different opinion: *āgantukapaṭṭaṃ moghasuttana sibbetvā ṭhapenti*, Vjb 312, 22 “they fix a patch after

fastens (*bandhati*) the patch<sup>36</sup>; (who) cuts (a piece of cloth to be used as) border, smoothes<sup>37</sup> (it and) attaches (*āropeti*) (it), sews a hem there (where it is attached); (who) makes a thread<sup>38</sup>, twists (different strands to unite them<sup>39</sup>); whets scissors; makes a winder for the thread<sup>40</sup>, every single (monk) makes a robe' thus it is said. However, the one who sits in the vicinity and tells a Jātaka or (a story from) the Dhammapada(-aṭṭhakathā), is not a cloth maker".

Apart from the information on tailoring, which can be gathered from this short paragraph, this is one of the rather rare instances, where we learn something about the use of texts. For, while tailoring the monks were entertained or entertained themselves

having (it) sewn by a tacking thread". Either could be correct. This diversity of opinion aptly shows that there was no uniform tradition of the terminology of tailoring.

<sup>34</sup> *accchindirvā anvādbhiṃ āropetvā karaṇacīvaraṃ sandhāya vuttaṃ*, Vmv II 27, 17 "this is said concerning a cloth for making (a robe) (?) after attaching an extra supply without cutting". This is more or less quoted from *anvādbikaṃ pi āropetun ti* (Vin I 297, 30) *āgantukapaṭṭaṇi dātum. idaṃ pana appabonake āropetabbaṃ. sace paboti, āgantukapaṭṭaṇi na vaṭṭati, chinditabbam eva*, Sp 1129, 17-19 "to attach an extra supply means: to give a patch. This, however, must be attached if it does not fit. If it fits, a patch is not allowed, on the contrary, it has to be cut". The Vimativinodanī continues: *thapetīti ekaṃ antaṃ cīvare bandhanavasena thapeti* "fixes means: he fixes one end (of the patch) by fastening it to the cloth."

<sup>35</sup> *paccāgataṃ sibbetīti tass' eva dutiyantaṃ parivattirvā ābataṃ sibbeti*, Vmv II 27, 18f. "He sews a hem means: having folded the second end (of that very patch, see preceding note) he sews [that is he fixes the border of the patch by folding the outer end backwards (*parivattirvā*) in the direction of the cloth (*ābataṃ*)]."  
— It is tempting to understand *gatapaccāgata* in the definition of different kinds of discarded cloth (*paṇṣukūla*) in spite of *gatapaccāgatan yaṃ manussā susānaṃ gantvā paccāgatā nabatvā chaddenti*, Vism 63, 8 as "(a robe) without hem" that is worn out. The next items in this enumeration are *aggidaddha* "burnt by fire" and *gokhāyita* "gnawed by cattle", Vism 63, 9f.

<sup>36</sup> *āgantukapaṭṭaṃ bandhatīti cīvarena laggaṃ karonto punappunam tattha tattha suttana bandhati*, Vmv II 27, 20 "he fastens the patch means: he fastens it again and again here and there by a thread, while making it adhere to the cloth".

<sup>37</sup> *ghaṭṭetīti pamāṇena gabetvā daṇḍādībi (v. l. dabbādībi) ghaṭṭeti*, Vmv II 27, 21 "he smoothes means: he takes (a piece of cloth) according to the (correct) measure and smoothes it with a stick (piece of wood) etc."; vgl. *tattha anuvāte yathā ekatalaṃ hoti tatthā hatthehi ghaṭṭeti*, Vjb 312, 23 "there (on the patch) he rubs the border in that way with his hands that it becomes flat" and *ghaṭṭetīti anuvātaṃ chindirvā hatthena daṇḍena vā ghaṭṭeti*, Sp-ṭ III 55, 16f.

<sup>38</sup> *suttaṃ karotīti guṇādibhāvena vaṭṭeti*, Vmv II 27, 21f. ≠ Sp-ṭ III 55, 16 "he makes a thread means: he twists it as a strand etc."

<sup>39</sup> *valetīti anekaguṇasuttaṃ hatthena vā cakkadaṇḍena vā vaṭṭeti ekantaṃ karoti*, Vmv II 27, 22 "he twists means: he takes a thread with different strands and twists it with his hand or with a (perforated) board and a handle": This way of twisting ropes is described by G. A. Grierson: Bihar Peasant Life. Patna<sup>2</sup> 1926 § 598 (the modern terms are still the same: *carakh* and *daṇḍī*); vgl. *valetīti āvaṭṭeti*, Vjb 312, 24 and *daṇḍena vā hatthena vā āvaṭṭeti*, Sp-ṭ III 55, 18.

<sup>40</sup> *parivattanam karotīti parivattanadaṇḍayantakaṃ karoti, yasmiṃ suttaguḷaṃ pavesetvā veūnālīkādisu thapetvā paribbhamāpetvā suttakotito paṭṭhāya ākaddhanti*, Vmv II 27, 23-25 "he makes a winder for the strands means: they make a device with turning sticks, into which he puts a ball of threads fastens it on bamboo sticks or reeds, makes it turn and pulls the thread from its beginning"; cf. *suttaṃ gaṇhantānaṃ sukbaggaḥaṇṭhaṃ suttaparivattanam karoti. paṭṭaṃ sibbantānaṃ sukhasibbanatthapaṭṭaparivattanaṃ ca*, Vjb 312, 25. The word *parivatta(na)* survives as Hindi etc., cf. R. L. Turner: A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages. London 1968, no. 7871 *parivarta*. The technical meaning is not listed by Turner for *parivarta* nor *parivattana*. The device is described by Grierson: Bihar Peasant Life, as preceding note, §

by listening to edifying stories.

Some monks seem to have acquired quite a reputation as skilful tailors while working for their brethren. This is told in the introductory story (*paccuppannavatthu*) of Jātaka no. 38 Baka-jātaka: “A certain monk living in the Jetavana was highly skilful in all matters concerning the manufacturing of robes such as cutting (*chedana*), smoothing (*ghaṭṭana*), measuring (*vicāraṇa*), sewing (*sibbana*) etc. Because he used to embellish (*vaḍḍhati*) robes, he was known as the ‘robe-embellisher’ (*cīvaravaḍḍhaka*). But what did he do? He applied his craft to old rags and made a cloth pleasant to touch and agreeable, and, after dyeing it, he dyed (it again) by water mixed with powder (*piṭṭhodakena*?<sup>41</sup>), removed (the powder?) with a shell, made it shining and charming and put it aside.

Monks who did not know how to make robes saw him with new cloth (*abhata sāṭaka*) in saying: ‘We do not know how to make robes, make a robe for us’. He replied: ‘To make a robe, reverend sir, takes a long time. I do have a ready made robe, leave the cloth here, take it and go’ took (the robe) out and showed it. They saw the splendid colour, but did not recognize the inner structure, agreed by saying ‘Certainly’, gave the cloth to the robe-embellisher, took (the embellished robe) and went away. When they washed it in hot water after it was soiled after a short while, it showed its true nature. It was recognized that it was worn out here and there. They regretted (their exchange). Having cheated monks seeing him time and again, he became well known everywhere.

Just like this one in the Jetavana, a robe-embellisher in a certain village also cheated people. His fellow monks told him: ‘Sir, a robe-embellisher in the Jetavana cheats people.’ Then he thought: ‘I should cheat this city dweller’. He made an excessively charming robe from rags, dyed it carefully, put in on and went to the Jetavana. When the other one saw him, he became greedy: ‘Sir, give me that robe, you will receive another one’. ‘Venerable sir, we are living in a village, where requisites are difficult to find. When I present this one to you, what should I wear myself?’ ‘Sir, I have new cloth (*abhata sāṭaka*). Take it and make a cloth for you’. ‘Venerable sir, I have applied my craft on this (robe). However, if you say so, what can be done? Take it.’ He gave him the robe made from rags and went away thus cheating him. The monk living in the Jetavana wore that robe, washed it a few days later in hot water, saw the worn rags and felt ashamed. ‘The robe-embellisher living in a village cheated the one living in the Jetavana’: His being cheated became known to the community of monks” (Ja I 220, 16-221, 15).

Leaving morals aside, which are, of course, the fruit of actions in previous births, the paragraphs from the Samantapāsādikā and from the Jātaka demonstrate that monks obviously needed some equipment and tools for tailoring. Consequently, needles for sewing robes are mentioned among the rather few requisites which a monk is permitted to own. Originally, the possessions of each individual Buddhist monk were rather limited<sup>42</sup>. First, there is of course the set of three robes (1. *ticīvara*), the inner robe with five widths

---

353, 501.

<sup>41</sup> This is some sort of colour, it seems: *lākhāya vā mañjittṭhiyā vā piṭṭhodake vā ... temervā*, Sp 612, 9f.

covering the body from the waist to below the knees (*antaravāsaka*) with a waist band (2. *kāyabandhana*), the upper robe (*uttarāsaṅga*) with seven widths wrapped around the shoulders, and finally some sort of cloak (*saṅghātī*) with nine widths. A Furthermore, a Buddhist monk owns his alms bowl (3. *patto*) and he is allowed a mat to sit on (4. *nisīdana*). To make sure that no living being is killed accidentally when drinking water, a cloth is used as a filter (5. *parissāvana*) and a small jug to collect the water (6. *dhammakaraka*). The needles for sewing are kept in a little box (7. *sūcighara*).

In course of time this modest set of possessions started to grow and in the end the number of requisites almost doubled from seven to twelve. Different vessels were added, as was a staff, further an umbrella or sandals alternatively, and even a small hatchet. This was needed to cut “tooth brushes”. For, the custom to use twigs of the neem tree for cleaning the teeth, which is still living in India, can be traced back to the early times of Indian culture<sup>43</sup>.

Of course every single item in this set of requisites served a specific purpose. However, as noted in the commentaries, the requisites might be used for other purposes as well. The *Sumaṅgalavilāsini* draws up a list how the requisites are serving alternatively the body or the belly:

*ticīvaraṇ ca patto ca vāsi sūci ca bandhanaṃ  
parissāvanena atṭh'ete yuttayogassa bbikkhuno  
te sabbe kāyaparibhāriyā pi bonti kucchiparibhāriyā pi. kathaṃ?*

*Ticīvaran tāva nivāsetvā pārupitvā ca vicaraṇakāle kāyaṃ pariharati posetīti  
kāyaparibhāriyaṃ hoti. cīvarakaṇṇena udakaṃ parissāvetvā pīvanakāle  
khāditaḥḥapalāphalaṃ gabaṇakāle ca kucchiṃ pariharati posetīti kucchiparibhāriyaṃ  
hoti.*

*Patto pi tena udakaṃ uddharitvā nahānakāle kuṭiparibhaṇḍakaraṇakāle ca  
kāyaparibhāriko hoti. ābhāraṃ gahetvā bhūñjanakāle kucchiparibhāriyo.*

*Vāsi pi tāya dantakaṭṭhacchedanakāle mañcapīṭhānaṃ  
aṅgapādacīvarakuṭidaṇḍakasajjanakāle ca kāyaparibhārikā hoti.  
ucchucchedananāḷikerāditacchanakāle kucchiparibhārikā.*

*Sūci pi cīvarasibbanakāle kāyaparibhārikā hoti. pūvaṃ vā phalaṃ vā vijjhitvā  
khādanakāle kucchiparibhārikā.*

*Kāyabandhanaṃ bandhitvā vicaraṇakāle kāyaparibhārikaṃ. ucchuādīni bandhitvā  
gabaṇakāle kucchiparibhāriyaṃ.*

*Parissāvanaṃ tena udakaṃ parissāvetvā nahānakāle  
senāsanaparibhaṇḍakaraṇakāle ca kāyaparibhārikaṃ. pāṇīyapāṇakaparissāvanakāle ten'  
eva tilataṇḍulaputtbukādīni gahetvā khādanakāle ca kucchiparibhāriyaṃ, Sv 206, 11\*-32*

“A set of three robes, and an alms bowl, a hatchet and a needle, a band,  
together with the (water) filter these eight belong to a Monk earnest in his

<sup>42</sup> The respective objects are enumerated, e.g., at Vin II 301, 34f.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. G. Watt: The Commercial Products of India Being an Abridgment of “The Dictionary of the

endeavours.

All these serve the body and the belly. How?

The set of three robes protects and takes care of the body when put on (*antaravāsaka*) and wrapped (around the body: *uttarāsāṅga*) during the time of wandering about. Thus it is serving the body. Having filtered water with the end of a robe when drinking and when collecting all sorts of eatable fruits, it protects and takes care of the belly. Thus it serves the belly.

The alms bowl is serving the body as well, when water is fetched in it at the time of taking a bath or at the time of renovating (or cleaning) the cell. When collecting food at the time of a meal it serves the belly.

The hatchet is serving the body as well when wood to clean the teeth is cut and when, for beds and stools, supports, feet, ‘tents (*cīvarakuṭi*)’, handles are prepared. When sugar cane is cut or coconuts are opened, it serves the belly.

The needle serves the body as well at the time of sewing robes. When cakes or fruits are pierced at the time of eating, it serves the belly.

The waist band serves the body when put on during the time of wandering. When sugar cane etc. is bound together at the time of collecting it, it serves the belly.

The (water) filter serves the body, when it is used to filter water at the time of taking a bath or cleaning the furniture. At the time of filtering drinking water and when collecting sesame seeds, husked or wild rice in it at the time of eating, it serves the belly”.

When carrying all these requisites, it was obviously feared that Buddhist monks started to look very similar to mendicants of different sects such as the one depicted at Bharhut<sup>44</sup>. Looking at the ever growing number of requisites, the monks were occasionally tormented by their conscience, it seems. Therefore, the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* hastens to add something to reassure the readers of this commentary, who, of course, were Buddhist monks: *etesu ca aṭṭhaparikkhāriko va santuṭṭho, itare asantuṭṭhā mahicchā ca mahābhārā ti na vattabbā*, Sv 207, 6f. “Among these only the one with eight requisites is modest, the others should not be called immoderate, greedy, overburdened”.

The opinion hinted at by the commentator that monks using too many requisites were criticised was not altogether unfounded, because it is supported by the story of the greedy monk Upananda. In the introduction (*paccuppannavatthu*) of no. 296 *Samudda-jātaka*, Upananda is described as follows:

*so* (sc. *Upanando Sakyaputto*) *hi mahagghaso mahātaṇho abosi. sakatapūrehi paccayehi santappetun na sakkā. vassūpanāyikakāle dvīsu tīsu vibāresu vassam upagantvā ekasmin*

Economic Products of India”. London 1908, p. 780 s. v. MELIA, *Linn.*

<sup>44</sup> Coomaraswamy: Sculpture de Bharhut, as note 15 above, plate XLI, fig. 137 illustrating no. 528. *Mahābodhi-jātaka*, Ja V 232, 9\*f., cf. O. v. Ilinüber: Sprachentwicklung und Kulturgeschichte. Ein Beitrag zur materiellen Kultur des buddhistischen Klosterlebens. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jg 1992, Nr. 6, p. 53f.

*upāhanā t̥hapeti ekasmiṇ kattarayaṭṭhiṇ ekasmiṇ udakatumbaṇ ekasmiṇ sayañ vasati.*

*janapadavibhāraṇ gantvā paṇṭaparikkhāre bhikkhū disvā ariyavaṇsakathaṇ kathetvā te paṇsukūlāni gāhāpetvā tesañ cīvarāni gaṇhāti. mattikapatte gāhāpetvā manāpamanāpe patte ca thālakāni ca gaṇhāti, Ja II 441, 6-13*

“For he had an enormous appetite and an enormous thirst. It was impossible to satisfy him even by card loads of requisites. At the time when the monks entered the rainy season he would do so in two or three monasteries by placing his sandals in one, his staff in another, his water pot again in another one, and lived himself in still another one.

When he wandered around and saw monks carrying exquisite requisites, he would explain the ‘text on the noble lineage’<sup>45</sup>, made them accept (his own robes) made from rags and took their robes. He would make them accept alms bowls made of clay and take their wonderful bowls and beakers”.

Other details of this story can be gathered from the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā:

*so (sc. Upanando Sakyaputto) ekasmiṇ antovasse upakaṭṭhe janapadam agamāsi. atha naṇ ekasmiṇ vibhāre daharasāmaṇerā dhammakathikāpemeṇa ‘bhante idha vassaṇ upethā’ ti vatvā ‘idha kittakaṇ vassavāsikaṇ labbhati’ ti pucchite tehi ‘ekeko sātaka’ ti vutte tattva upāhanā t̥hapetvā aññaṇ vibhāraṇ agamāsi, dutiyaṇ pi vibhāraṇ gantvā ‘idha kiṇ labbhati’ ti pucchitvā ‘dve sātakā’ ti vutte kattarayaṭṭhiṇ t̥hapesi. tatiyaṇ vibhāraṇ gantvā ‘idha kiṇ labbhati’ ti pucchitvā ‘tayo sātakā’ ti vutte udakatumbaṇ t̥hapesi. catutthaṇ vibhāraṇ gantvā ‘idha kiṇ labbhati’ ti pucchitvā ‘cattāro sātakā’ ti vutte ‘sādhū idha vasissāmi’ ti tattva vassaṇ upagantvā gahaṭṭhānaṇ ceva bhikkhūnaṇ ca dhammakathaṇ kathesi. te naṇ bahūhi vattthehi ceva cīvarehi ca pūjesuṇ. so vutthavasso itaresu pi vibhāresu sāsaṇaṇ pesetvā ‘mayā parikkhārassa t̥hapitattā vassavāsikaṇ laddhabbaṇ. taṇ me pabhiṇantū’ ti sabbaṇ āharāpetvā yānakaṇ pūretvā pāyāsi, Dhpa III 139, 17-140, 12*

“He wandered around in the countryside, when the rainy season drew near. When the young novices in one monastery asked him out of their sympathy for a teacher of the Dhamma ‘Sir, enter the rainy season here’ he asked them ‘How much does one get here for spending the rainy season?’ and they said ‘One robe each’. Then he deposited his sandals there and went to another monastery. Arriving at the second monastery he asked ‘What does one get here?’ When they said ‘two robes’, he deposited his staff. Arriving at the third monastery he asked ‘What does one get here?’ When they said ‘Three robes’, he deposited his water pot. Arriving at the fourth monastery he asked ‘What does one get here?’ When they said ‘Four robes’, he said ‘Excellent. Here I will live’, and he entered the rainy season there. He taught the Dhamma to householders and monks alike. They honoured him with lots of cloth and robes. At the end of the rainy season he sent a request also to the other monasteries ‘I am entitled to the gains made during the rainy season, because I deposited my requisites’. He collected everything, filled a cart and left”.

<sup>45</sup> This is AN II 27, 16-29, 3 on being content with little.

Quite obviously, this story is grossly exaggerated. Still, it draws the attention to the simple fact that Buddhist monks not only were human beings and as such always tempted by greediness, but at the same time also to a real conflict. Laymen wanted to gain a better rebirth by accumulating good karma, which, as it is well known, was done by donation to the Buddhist community or to individual monks. The monks, however, were expected to live modestly, if not in poverty. And it is exactly this rule, which is skilfully used by Upananda, when he preached the Ariyavaṃsasutta, which praises the simple way of life.

Certainly there was a real conflict: The monks were and are unable to simply refuse gifts by laymen thus destroying their wish to make merit in order to advance their chances for a better reincarnation<sup>46</sup>. On the other hand, the monks were and are expected not to live in luxury, which would easily happen after accepting too many precious gifts. Thus, Buddhist monks lived in permanent temptation, and consequently the pursuit of worldly goods is as old as the fight for keeping up modesty and poverty. And this conflict between poverty aspired to and forced possession has deeply influenced the way of life of Buddhist monks, occasionally leading to tragic-comical situations. A Thai monk reported once that well meaning laymen presented him with lots of different medicine. In spite of being in excellent health the monk felt obliged to take at least some of the medicine to ensure the merit of his well wishers. Of course his health did not profit from this pious attitude and he fell seriously ill.

The roots of this conflict is that the Buddhist order was founded as a community of mendicants, as the self-denomination *bhikkhu* “beggar” aptly demonstrates. It is worth while to recall that in spite of this intention no vow of poverty exists in Buddhism. Instead, there is an apparently very old set of rules, which entails a life at least originally in extreme destitution. These “four basic rules” (*cattāro nissaya*) were introduced according to the Vinaya to avoid that men joined the *saṅgha* only *udarassa kāraṇā*, Vin I 58, 3 “because of the belly<sup>47</sup>”. They are communicated to all Buddhist monks during the ordination ceremony: “going forth is on account of meals of scraps (1. *piṇḍiyālopabbhājā*), in this respect effort is to be made by you for life, ... on account of rag-robbs (2. *paṃsukūlacīvara*), ... on account of a lodging at the foot of a tree (3. *rukkhamaḷasenāsana*), ... on account of purifying<sup>48</sup> urine as medicine (4. *pūtimuttabbhesajja*)”.

This strict rigor, however, was mitigated soon. For there are exceptions to each of the four *nissaya*: “(These are) extra acquisitions (*atirekalābha*): a meal for an order (*saṅghabhatta*), a meal assigned to an individual (*uddesabhatta*), an invitation (*nimantana*),

<sup>46</sup> Refusing to accept gifts was indeed seen as a weapon against laymen who did not live up to their status as *upāsakas*, and it was first used against the Licchavi Vaddha: Vin II 124, 14-127, 12.

<sup>47</sup> The success was limited. For, as the disciple of the mendicant confesses right at the beginning of the Bhagavadajjuka, he joined the Buddhist order *pādarasaṇaṇoheṇa sakkiasamaṇaṇaṃ pavvaido mhi* (*prātaraṇalobbhena śākyaśramaṇakaṃ pravrajito 'smi*) “longing for a breakfast I joined the Śākya mendicants”; on this text see below.

<sup>48</sup> This translation follows a suggestion made by A. Wezler, Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society 4, 1955, p. 226.

a ticket-food (*salākabbatta*), (food given) on the day of the waxing or waning moon (*pakkhika*), on an observance day (*uposathika*), on the day after the observance day (*pāṭipadika*) ... (robes made of) linen (*khoma*), cotton (*kappāsika*), silk (*koseyya*), wool (*kambala*), coarse hemp (*sāṇa*), canvas (*bhaṅga*) ... a dwelling place (*vihāra*), a long house (? *aḍḍhayoga*), a large house (*pasāda*), a mansion (*hammiya*), a cave (*leṇa*), ... ghee (*sappi*), fresh butter (*navanīta*), oil (*tela*), honey (*madhu*), brown sugar (*phāṇita*)<sup>49</sup>.

In spite of these mitigations, the Buddhist remained committed to modesty and were, first of all, very strict in one particular respect: The use of money was and is absolutely ruled out. Now, if the enormous buildings at Nālandā for instance are kept in mind, where thousands of people were accommodated, monks and their personal in kitchen and garden, and finally numerous students, who, if we follow Yi-jing, were not at all bothered by **spiritual progress**, but had a worldly career in mind<sup>50</sup>, if the huge administrative machinery is considered necessary to run this famous university, it is really difficult to imagine that this was all done without the use of money. The world of outdated normative texts with all their unchangeable legal rules and regulations had to clash earlier or later with a changing reality, because also Buddhist monks were living in a developing world.

Therefore the question arises how Buddhists managed to harmonize their texts with reality. Now, the Buddhist certainly were the best lawyers in ancient India and as smart legal experts they did find ways out of this and many other predicaments. If a layman wanted to present money to a monk, which neither was nor is uncommon practice, the monk is unable to accept it directly. However, the money could be handed over to an administrator, a trustee of the monk. This administrator being a layman could easily handle the money presented either to individual monks or to the order without any rule being broken.

Money, however, was not the only object unacceptable to a monk. This raises the more general question, what was a monk expected to do, if he was offered objects he could not accept. As stated above, simple refusal was often ruled out. Therefore it did happen that a monk suddenly acquired possessions he was not supposed to have, even if he was by no means as greedy as Upananda. If a monk had acquired what was called a surplus possession, the respective object had to be discarded. However, if a surplus alms bowl for instance was given up, there has to be also a recipient, to whom it was given. The recipient was the community of Buddhist monks, the *saṅgha*, whose property would increase by objects discarded by individual monks.

<sup>49</sup> The abridged translation follows I. B. Horner. In detail on these rules: O. v. Hinüber: *Das Pātimokkhasutta — Seine Gestalt und seine Entstehungsgeschichte*. (Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus II). Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jg 1999, Nr. 6, chapter IV.2.1.1, p. 41ff.

<sup>50</sup> Students graduating from Nālandā seem to have been quite successful also in worldly careers: A Record of the Buddhist Religion, as note 7 above, p. 177, cf. also Samuel Beal: *Hsuan-tsang: Si-yu-ki: Buddhist records of the western world*. Translated from the Chinese of Hsien Tsiang (AD 629), 2 Bände. London 1884, Nachdruck Delhi 1969, Vol. II, p. 170.



Consequently, there were objects, which belonged to the community as a whole (*saṃghika*), while other objects or goods were owned by individual monks (*puggalika*). The number of objects allowed to individuals was clearly defined and limited those of the whole community were not. Rules concerning the common property prescribe first of all that they must neither be disposed of nor distributed to nor appropriated by any individual monks.

Even money, which a monk had to give up as a matter of course, could become such common property, if it was given to a trustee. This layman could use and spend the money on behalf of the community of Buddhist monks. However, even he would not be free to buy whatever the *saṃgha* wanted from this particular money. On the contrary, the objects that could be bought were strictly limited to goods such as ghee, oil, honey or brown sugar (Vin III 238, 18). Then, it was permitted to the *saṃgha* to consume this oil or honey, but, much more important, oil and honey could also be exchanged for other goods, which were now neither defined nor limited. The Samantapāsādikā describes this in detail:

*rūpiyapaṭiggāhakaṃ ṭhapetvā sabbeḥ' eva paribbuñjitabbau (Vin III 238, 20) ti sabbehi bhājetvā paribbuñjitabbaṃ. rūpiyapaṭiggāhakena bhāgo na gahetabbo, aññesaṃ pi bhikkhūnaṃ ārāmikānaṃ vā pattaḥāgam pi labhitvā paribbuñjituṃ na vaṭṭati ... tena vatthunā mañcapīṭhādīni vā gaṇhanti uposathāgāraṃ vā bhojanasālaṃ vā karonti paribbuñjituṃ na vaṭṭati. chāyā pi gehaparicchedena ṭhitā na vaṭṭati, paricchedātikkantā āgantukā vaṭṭati, Sp 692, 1-12*

“Except the monk who accepted the money, all can use (it) means: It should be used by all (monks) after being distributed. The monk who accepted the money must not receive a share. It is also not allowed (for him) to use the share received by other monks or monastic servants<sup>51</sup> ... if (the monks) acquire furniture or build a house for the *uposatha* or a refectory, he is not allowed to use it. Even the shade which falls over the precincts of a building (built by using the money discarded) is not permitted, if (the shade) surpasses (the precincts), it is allowed, as something additional (i.e., that has no connection to objects acquired and, consequently, to the money)<sup>52</sup>.”

It is most surprising to go through the list of items that could be acquired by the community of Buddhist monks in this manner. In addition to the buildings just mentioned goods and objects of extraordinary value are mentioned such as ships, dams, irrigation tanks, parks and fields (Sp 692, 11-27). Of course the offender is excluded from the use of all these objects: If this enumeration is taken literally, the offending monk must have

<sup>51</sup> It is noteworthy that also the *ārāṃikas* received a share, cf. Nobuyuki Yamagiwa: *Ārāṃika — Gardener or Park Keeper? One of the Marginals around the Buddhist Saṃgha*, in: *Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodō Mori*, Hamamatsu 2002, p. 363-385, particularly p. 380.

<sup>52</sup> Because it was not included in things acquired by using the discarded money like water in a pond bought empty: *anto udake pana asati aññaṃ āgantukkaudakaṃ vā vassodakaṃ vā vaṭṭati*, Sp 692, 17 “if there is not water (in the pond bought), other water let in (after the transaction) or rain water is permitted”.

accepted an exorbitant sum of money ...

Still it remains strange and astonishing that on the one side monks were strictly forbidden to own any money, and were, consequently, unable to enter any shop as simple customers, but they were, on the other side, doing exchange deals in grand style. This obviously is a glaring contradiction hard to overlook, and this was seen of course by the Buddhists themselves. Therefore, all sorts of deals are indeed forbidden. This is stated with all desirable clarity in the normative texts, when Nissaggiya Pācittiya no. 20 forbids “buying and selling (*kayavikkaya*).” This is how monks should live. How they actually did live, can be learned from the interpretation of the rules. In the case of exchanging goods, the Buddhist lawyers are in exceptionally good luck, because the formulation of the Vinaya allowed them to find a shrewd interpretation permitting almost any exchange deal.

The relevant rule itself does not leave the slightest doubt that all and every exchange deal is forbidden for Buddhist monks: *yo pana bhikkhu nānappakāraṇaṃ kayavikkayaṃ samāpajjeyyā, nissaggiyaṃ pācittiyaṃ*, Vin III 241,26\*\*f. “which monk, however, should engage in any buying or selling, (commits) an offence which entails giving up (the object acquired)”. The oldest commentary, the canonical Suttavibhaṅga, defines *nānappakāraṇaṃ* as “requisites such as robes, food, furniture, medicine for the sick” that is all the few things a monk was permitted to own and, consequently, could “buy or sell” by exchange. This, however, would be an offence. Although this seems to be a very clear statement, later commentators succeeded in almost reversing its meaning.

The unknown author(s) of the Sainantapāsādikā and possibly already his or their predecessors correctly say when explaining *nānappakāraṇaṃ: cīvarādīnaṃ kappiyabhaṇḍānaṃ vasena anekavidhaṃ, ten’ eva assa padabbājane cīvaraṃ ādiṃ katvā dasikasuttapariyosānaṃ kappiyabhaṇḍam eva dassitaṃ. akappiyabhaṇḍaparivattanaṃ hi kayavikkayasāṅgahaṃ na gacchati*, Sp 799, 23-31 “different things means: because permitted objects such as robes etc. are manifold, therefore permitted objects are shown in its commentary beginning from the robe ending in the threads of the border (of any garment). For, exchange of objects, which are **not** permitted, is **not** covered by ‘buying and selling’”.

This unexpected turn of thought opens floodgates: The community of Buddhist monks can engage in large scale exchange as long as monks do not exchange any of their requisites such as tooth brushes. Complete buildings, on the other hand, do no longer pose any problem and can be exchanged without the slightest reservation or remorse. If, for instance, a house owned by a layman and located on the compound of a Buddhist monastery is exchanged against another house owned by the *saṃgha*, but located far away from that monastery, or if an orchard far away from the monastery, it is easily possible to offer this house or this garden to a layman, who in turn owns another garden in the vicinity.

When engaging in deals like this the problem of unequal value could arise, because a garden belonging to the Buddhist monks might be smaller than the one which they would wish to receive in exchange. All the monks have to do is to draw the attention of

the layman to this fact: *sace pana manussānaṃ bahutarā rukkhā bonti: 'nanu tumbākam bahutarā rukkhā' ti vattabbaṃ. 'sace atirekaṃ, ambākam puññaṃ hotu, saṅghassa demā' ti vadanti. jānāpetvā sampatichhituṃ vaṭṭati*, Sp 1238, 20-24 “If, however, the laymen own more trees, it is necessary to say: ‘Aren’t you owning more trees?’ They (the laymen) say: ‘If there is a surplus, this will be our merit. We give it (the garden: *ārāma*) to the *saṅgha*.’ Having notified, it is allowed to accept”.

In this way the community of Buddhist monks succeeded in legally owning land and buildings, which were donated in course of time, and which could be managed skilfully in order to preserve or even to increase their value, if the rules of the Vinaya were applied following the current interpretation. Real estate on the other hand unavoidably also needs preservation and renovation from time to time, in case of a mansion (*pāsāda*) every eleven years (Sp 1246, 10). This kind of work used to be costly also in ancient India. Therefore the monks are advised in detail how to collect the money necessary for renovation work:

*sace so āvāso jīrati, āvāsasāmikassa vā tassa vaṃse uppannassa vā kassaci kutthetabbaṃ: 'āvāso vo nassati. jagghatha etaṃ āvāsaṃ' ti. sace so na sakkoti, bhikkhūhi ūtāke vā upaṭṭhāke vā samādepatvā jaggitabbo. sace te pi na sakkonti, saṅghikena paccayena jaggitabbo. tasmim pi asati, ekaṃ āvāsaṃ vissajjetvā avasesā jaggetabbā. babū vissajjetvā ekaṃ saṅghapetuṃ pi vaṭṭati yeva. dubbhikkhe bhikkhūsu pakkantesu sabbe āvāsā nassanti. tasmā eko dve vā tayo vā āvāse vissajjetvā tato yāgubhattacīvarādīni paribhuñjantehi sesā āvāsā jaggitabbā yeva.*

*Kurundiyaṃ pana vuttaṃ: saṅghike paccaye asati eko bhikkhu: 'tuyhaṃ ekaṃ mañcatthānaṃ gabetvā jaggāhi' ti vattabbo. sace bahutarāni icchati, tibhāgaṃ vā upadḍhabhāgaṃ vā datvā pi jaggāpetabbo. atha: 'thambhamattam evettha avasiṭṭhaṃ. habu kammaṃ kattabban' ti na icchati. 'tuyhaṃ puggalikam eva katvā jagga, evaṃ pi hi saṅghassa bhaṇḍakatthapanatthānaṃ ca navakānaṃ ca vasanatthānaṃ bhavissati' ti jaggāpetabbo. evaṃ jaggitō pana tasmim jīvante puggaliko hoti, mate saṅghiko yeva. sace saddhivihārikānaṃ dātukāmo hoti, kammaṃ oloketvā tatiyabhāgaṃ vā upadḍhabhāgaṃ vā puggalikaṃ katvā jaggāpetabbo. etaṃ hi saddhivihārikānaṃ dātuṃ labhati. evaṃ jagganake pana asati ekaṃ āvāsaṃ vissajjetvā ti ādinā nayena jaggāpetabbo, Sp 1246, 19-1247, 5*

“If the residence falls into decay, one should tell the owner of the residence (*āvāsasāmi*)<sup>53</sup> or somebody born into his family: ‘Your residence is decaying. Take care of this residence’. If he is unable to do so, the monks must alert (their own) relatives or supporters and take care (of the residence themselves). If they are also unable to do so, it must be taken care of by means of resources of the *saṅgha*. If they are unavailable, one residence should be given away and the rest

<sup>53</sup> This term, which is very rare in Pāli, obviously corresponds to the *vihārasvāmin* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins: G. Schopen: Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticism. JIASB 19.1.1996, p. 81-126 = Buddhist Monks and Business Matters, as note 3 above, p. 219-259. Similar problems concerning the repairs of monasteries are discussed in a Mūlasarvāstivāda context by G. Schopen: Art, Beauty, and the Business of Running a Buddhist Monastery in Early Northwest India, ibidem p. 19-44, particularly p. 27f.

taken care of (with the money received). It is allowed to give up many to preserve one. When during a famine the monks walk away, all residences are decaying. Therefore one or two or three residences should be given away, and then the remaining residences should be taken care of by those using gruel, food, robes etc. (acquired by the money received from selling the residences)<sup>54</sup>.

In the Kurundī it is however said: 'When there are no resources belonging to the *saṃgha*, one should tell a monk: 'Take care of a room for one bed'. If he wishes more, one should give him one third or one half (of the residence) and make him taking care of it. Then, (if) he does not want it: 'Here only one post is left. There is a lot of work to be done', he should be made taking care of it: 'Take it into your personal possession and take care of it. For, in this way there will be storage room for the *saṃgha* and a dwelling place for young (monks)'. If (the residence) is thus taken care of, it is lifelong in (his) personal possession, when he dies, (it returns into the) possession of the *saṃgha*. If he wishes to donate it to his fellow monks, he should supervise the work and convert one third or one half into personal possession. This may be given to fellow monks. If no one can be found, who takes care (of the residence), one should see to it that care is taken (of the residence) according to the procedure 'having given away one residence etc.'<sup>55</sup>."

Donating a building to the community of Buddhist monks seems to have resulted in a rather long-term financial obligation, if not a burden which could easily stretch over more than one generation. At the same time, texts like this one help to imagine how large monasteries such as Nālandā could subsist as long as there was a substantial and rich laity, on which the Buddhist monks could rely.

It is beyond doubt that the community of Buddhist monks was in the position to acquire substantial property such as large and lavishly furnished buildings, as they are described again in the Samantapāsādikā:

*suvaṇṇarajatādivicitrāṇi pi kavātāni mañcapīṭhāni tālavaṇṭāni suvaṇṇarajatamayāni pāṇiyaghaṭāni pāṇiyasarāvākāni vā yaṃ kiñci cittakammakatam sabbaṃ vaṭṭati. 'pāsādassa dāsīdāsakhattavattbugomahisaṃ demā' ti vadanti, pāṭekkaṃ gabaṇakiccaṃ natthi. pāsāde paṭiggabite paṭiggabitaṃ eva hoti, Sp 1236, 27-1237, 1*

"Doors, beds and stools, fans adorned by good and silver, golden and silver jugs for drinking water or cups for drinking water, all that is adorned is permitted. If (laymen) say: 'We give slave girls, slaves, fields, compounds, cows, buffalos for the mansion', it is unnecessary to formally accept every single item separately.

<sup>54</sup> In this way the monks could be fed and stay to take care of the necessary renovation.

<sup>55</sup> 'The reason for the difference of opinion put forward in the Kurundī is the obvious attempt to avoid an offence against the rule of the five things that may neither be given away (*avissajaniya*), i.e. sold, nor distributed to individuals monks (*avebhaṅgiya*), Vin II 170, 23; 171, 32 with: *vibhāro nāma yaṃ kiñci pāsādādisenāsaṇaṃ*, Sp 1237, 9f., although, in the end, both commentaries recommend an emergency procedure, which because of selling or transferring a residence to an individual monk, cannot be reconciled with Vin II 170.

Once the mansion is accepted, it is already accepted”.

This means that slaves etc. are accepted as included in the gift of a building, which opens a vast opportunity to accept legally items otherwise prohibited such as slaves<sup>56</sup>.

All this was certainly not the fancy of Buddhist lawyers eager to demonstrate their resourcefulness by imagining all conceivable cases. On the contrary, it corresponded well to the real world, though not always to the spirit of the Vinaya as non-Buddhist texts tell us. And these texts certainly help to imagine the past splendour of all the many halls and rooms in the monastery at Nālandā before the buildings decayed.

Living in such a monastery well furnished with all thinkable comforts of the then contemporary civilisation must have been most agreeable for a monk. Everywhere, also in ancient India, such comfort enjoyed by supposed ascetics does not escape the sharp eye of neither laity, who frequently visited or even lived for a while in Buddhist monasteries to accomplish their worldly education, nor, and first of all, members of other religious movements. These persons observed the easy and cosy life of many monks with open envy and commented on it, often by mockery. This is particularly true and evident in two Sanskrit dramas composed by Hindus. If Buddhist monks appear on the stage, there seemingly very comfortable life is ridiculed.

In the South Indian satire “The Venerable One and the Courtesan”, Bhagavadajjuka, which was written during the 7<sup>th</sup> century that is during the time, when Yi-jing and Xuan zang visited India and stayed at Nālandā, one of the principal characters is the pupil of a Hindu ascetic, the “Venerable one” mentioned in the title. This pupil introduces himself by describing his career in the following words:<sup>57</sup> “I was born in a Brahmin family, which lived on the remains of offerings left by crows. Our tongues were untouched by learning, though we wore our sacred thread around our necks, and were very proud of our status as Brahmins. As there was no food in our house, I was always hungry. To get something to eat in the morning, I converted to Buddhism, only to find that these bastards eat only once a day, which again left me hungry in the afternoon. So I tore up my robe, broke my alms bowl and kept only this useful umbrella. Presently, I have to carry the belongings of my wretched teacher”. Quite evidently, the prospect of a good life, at the very least regular food did attract men to Buddhist monkhood in ancient India, as it occasionally still does in Buddhist countries.

The confession of the mendicant’s pupil corresponds closely to a second play. Here, in the allegorical Prabodhacandrodaya composed by Kṛṣṇamiśra in the 10<sup>th</sup> century, the impersonated Buddhist religion appears on the stage book in hand. This characteristic

<sup>56</sup> It is stated explicitly that the Buddha abstained from accepting slaves etc., cf. O. v. Hinüber: *Das Pātimokkhasutta* p. 28f.

<sup>57</sup> Michael Lockwood, A. Vishnu Bhatt: *Metatheater and Sanskrit Drama*. Delhi 1994: Text and Translation of Bhagavad-ajjuka Prahāsanam (The Farce of the Saint-Courtesan), p. 2, lines 15ff.

feature, a book, is well chosen. For, in contrast to Hindus, the Buddhist created at an early date already an impressive culture around books and even “invented” pocket books<sup>58</sup> to be used by monks during their wanderings.

The Buddhist monk impersonating the Buddhist religion introduces himself with a verse:

*aho sādhubr ayaṇi saugatadharmaṃ yatra saukhyaṃ mokṣaś ca. tathā hi:*

*āvāso layanaṃ manoharam abhiprāyānurūpā vaṇiṇi*

*nāryo vāñchitakālam iṣṭam āsanaṃ śayyā nṛduprastarāḥ*

*śraddhāpūrvam upāsītā yuvatibhiḥ kṛptāṅgadānotsava-*

*kṛdānandabharaṇī vṛjanti vilasajjyotsnojjvalā rātryaḥ, Prabodh. III 9*

“Oh, excellent is this teaching of the Sugata, which combines comfort and salvation! For:

We live in splendid buildings, we are surrounded by the wives of merchants eager to serve, we have delicious food at any time and our beds have soft spreads. Our beautiful full moon nights are passed in the company of most devout young women, playfully prepared to do anything”.

This elegant verse with slightly bawdy undertones alludes to the correct observation that merchants were indeed the most important supporters of Buddhism<sup>59</sup>, although the role of their wives might have had — hopefully — slightly different goals of their eagerness. The full moon nights mentioned are of course the *uposatha* nights, when monks and laymen meet regularly. Again the observation is correct that the majority of the audience during the *uposatha* nights were indeed women, if the evidence preserved in inscriptions is compared, which shows how actively women were supporting Buddhism. The queens of the Palola Śāhis of Gilgit are one example among many<sup>60</sup>. This support by women has not changed over the centuries and can be easily observed in present days in the monasteries of Buddhist countries.

Obviously, Kṛṣṇamiśra as a Hindu author knew Buddhism well as did his later South Indian commentators as late as during the 16<sup>th</sup> century, who somewhat maliciously comment on this verse. Although both commentators of the Prabodhacandrodaya, Nāṇḍilla Gopa, the nephew of the general Sālva Timma, who served Kṛṣṇarāya of Vijayanagara (1609-1629), and Rāmadāsa Dīkṣita, still knew Buddhism astonishingly well. This

<sup>58</sup> O. v. Hinüber: Der Beginn der Schrift und frühe Schriftlichkeit in Indien. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jg 1989, Nr. 11, chapter XV, p. 71, and review of R. Salomon: Rhinoceros Sūtra. 2000. JAOS 123. 2003, p. 222.

<sup>59</sup> It may be recalled that the first laymen were the merchants Tapussa nad Bhallika (Vin I 3, 32ff.).

<sup>60</sup> O. v. Hinüber: Die Palola Śāhis. Ihre Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzzauber. (Antiquities of Northern Pakistan 5). Mainz 2004, p. 124ff., cf. A. Wezler: Zur Proklamation religiös-weltanschaulicher Toleranz bei dem indischen Philosophen Jayantabhaṭṭa. Saeculum 27. 1976, p. 329-347: Jayantabhaṭṭa criticises the good life of Buddhists in his drama Abhinavagamaḍambara in a similar way as Kṛṣṇamiśra does: p. 340.

corresponds to the fact that Buddhist bronzes were cast in South India as late as during the 17<sup>th</sup> century<sup>61</sup>.

However, how far are these descriptions of an easy and comfortable live correct, which are purposefully distorted by authors hostile against Buddhism? It is indeed possible to control these descriptions with the help of Buddhist texts. For, occasionally, even Buddhist authors criticized the behaviour of Buddhist monks as did the author of the *Rāṣṭrapālāpariprcchā* in a verse<sup>62</sup>:

*grddho grbhīṇa tathā kāmair yādṛśe pravrajitva te grddhbāḥ  
bhāryāḥ sutā duhitaraś ca teṣu bhaviṣya grabhasamānam*, RP 29, 11f.

“No householder would pursue the pleasures of the senses to such a degree as those, who enter the order with their wives, sons and daughter, to live as Buddhist monks like householders”.

These are strong words by a Buddhist about Buddhists, who supposedly live within the order as householders that is as laymen. Other Buddhist texts confirm this way of life, which was perhaps much less unusual than our sources normally would make us believe. In this connection, a text expressing disapproval of certain ways of live as led by some monks is remarkable:

*acchinnaḡibhandbano samaṇakuṭimikapuggalo .... ‘ko jānissati kiṃ bhavissati’ ti mahallakakāle pabbajanto pi ḡibibandhanam na vissajjeti. mahallakapabbajitānaṃ ca sampatti nāma natthi. tassa sace cīvaraṃ pāpuṇāti antacchinnaḡam vā jīṇḡadubhaṇṇam vā pāpuṇāti. senāsanam pi vihārapaccante paṇṇasālāya maṇḡape vā pāpuṇāti. piṇḡdāya carantenāpi pūṭigandhakānaṃ pacchato caritabbo hoti. pariyante nisīditabbaṃ hoti. tena so dukkhī dummāno assuṇi muṇcanto ‘atthi me kulasantakaṃ dhanam. kappati nu kho taṃ khādītva jīvītun’ ti cintevā ekaṃ vinayadharmaṃ pucchati: ‘kiṃ bhante ācariya attano santakaṃ bhāretvā khādītun kappati na kappati’. ‘natth ettha doso. kappat etan’ ti. so attano bhajamānake katipaye dubbacce durācāre bhikkhū gabetvā sāyaṇhasamayaṃ antogāmaṃ gantvā gāmamajjhe thito gāṃmike pakkosāpetvā ‘ambakaṃ payogato utthitaṃ ayaṃ. kassa detthā’ ti. ‘bhante, tumhe pabbajitā. kassa dassāmā’ ti. ‘kiṃ pabbajitānaṃ attano santakaṃ na vaṭṭatī’ ti kuddālapitakaṃ gabetvā kedāramariyādabbandhanādīni karonto nānappakāraṃ pubbaṇṇāparaṇṇaṃ ceva phalāphale ca saṇḡaṇḡhitvā hemantaḡimhavassānesu yaṃ yaṃ icchati taṃ taṃ pacāpetvā khādanto samaṇakuṭimiko viya jīvati. kevalam assa paṇcucūḡḡalakena dāraḡena saddhīm pādapāricārikā va ekā natthi*, Spk III. 32, 25-33, 17

<sup>61</sup> This was demonstrated by John Guy in his lecture “Buddhism in South India: Traces and Transmission” at Basel on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2003. Late interest in Buddhist art, if perhaps only as decoration, is shown by the find of a displaced Buddhist relief (in Amarāvati style?) in front of the “king’s audience hall” in the citadel (“Royal Enclosure”) in Vijayanagara: Indian Archaeology 1985/6 [1990], p. 40 and plate VIIA.

<sup>62</sup> On the radical tendencies of this text cf. G. Schopen: The Mahāyāna and the Middle Period in Indian Buddhism Through a Chinese Looking-glass. The Eastern Buddhist 32. 2000, p. 1-25 = Pigments and Fragments, as note 3 above, p. 3-24, particularly p. 15f.

“An individual, who has not cut the bonds to **worldly life, is an ascetic-family man**<sup>63</sup>: Although certain man became a monk during **old age only, he** did not cut the bonds to worldly life thinking: ‘Who knows, what is going to happen?’ Monks (ordaining during) old age do not gain prosperity (read *sampatti* with Be). If he receives a robe, he receives one with worn out edges, old and ugly. Also lodgings he receives at the far end of the monastery in a hut made of leaves or in an (open) pavilion. When begging for food he has to walk behind smelling (monks). He has to sit at the far end. Therefore, he became unhappy and dejected and shed tears thinking: ‘My family owns riches. Is it permitted to live by using them?’ He asked a monks well versed in Vinaya: ‘Is it permitted or not, sir, to collect one’s own possessions and use them?’ ‘There is no fault in it. It is permitted.’ He gathered some of his miserable fellow monks of bad reputation, went to a village in the evening and standing in the middle of the village announced to the people living there: ‘By our effort this income has been created. To whom do you give it?’ ‘Sir, you have become a monk. To whom, should we give it?’ ‘Have the monks no rights in their possessions?’ (Having said this), he took up hoe and basket, made small dams around fields etc.<sup>64</sup>, collected different kinds of harvests and all sorts of fruit, cooked for himself in winter, summer or rainy season whatever pleased him. Only there was not a single wife with a small child<sup>65</sup>”.

As the commentary on the *Samyuttanikāya* concludes this monk who acts following a most astonishing advice of a *vinayadhara* differs from a true householder only by the fact that he remained unmarried. Moreover, he is unable to reach *nirvāṇa*.

Nearer to real life than literary texts are documents, which are largely missing as sources for Buddhism in ancient India. Documents from Central Asia can fill this gap only to a modest degree. In the about 800 documents written around A.D. 300 and rediscovered by Aurel Stein in Niya, monks with wives and children are mentioned<sup>66</sup>, first of all a monk named Ānanda, who got involved in a law-suit because of gross misbehaviour. Document no. 345<sup>67</sup> describes who this law-suit was settled. It all had started when this Ānanda borrowed thirty pounds of grain from a layman and — *horribile dictu* — fifteen litres of wine without returning either. So, most likely, Ānanda enjoyed the wine. Worse, a slave of this Ānanda stole fifteen metres of silk, two ropes, two robes made of felt and finally two sheep. After the layman resorted to law, Ānanda had to pay

<sup>63</sup> Three *kuṭumbi-srāmaṇeras* Gopaka, Cheṇḍavaka and Dāsaka are mentioned in a Maitraka inscription: O. v. Ilinüber: Rev. of M. Njammasch: Bauern, Buddhisten und Brahmanen. 2001. IJ 47. 2004 [2006], p. 308-320, particularly p. 311f.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. *madhurambabījāṇi ropetvā samantā mariyādāṇi bandhivā kālānukālāṇi udakaṇi āsiñcivā*, Mp III 229, 21f., cf. note 19 above.

<sup>65</sup> The reading in Ec is faulty. For the meaning *padapariçārikā* “wife”: After Kaṇhā’s (Draupadī’s) *svayamvara*, her father gives her to the five Pāṇḍavas: *pādacārikāṇi adāsi*, Ja V 426, 19.

<sup>66</sup> On married monks cf. O. v. Ilinüber: Rev. of Der Buddhismus I. 2000, IJ 45. 2002, p. 82.

<sup>67</sup> Quoted after T. Burrow: A Translation of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan. London 1940.



for all the damage done. Moreover, the court ruled that he had to hand over to the court a cow as punishment. However, this did not really happen because of a settlement out of court according to which Ānanda's slave was given to the layman to make good for his loss. The conclusion from this evidence is clear: Ānanda owned a personal slave and a cow — at least the court assumed that — and finally also money that would have enabled him to pay the damages.

In spite of these negative descriptions of the behaviour of single Buddhist monks, the impression is certainly not correct that all monks followed all sorts of occupations to assure their good life and to increase their riches. There is no reason to doubt that the vast majority of monks seriously pursued their spiritual goals, particularly those who criticised their fellow monks for lax behaviour.

Again, very little is known about this side of the daily life of monks, even for places such as Nālandā. Only the daily routine of the Buddha himself is described at great length in the commentary to the Dīghanikāya (Sumaṅgalavilāsinī 45, 17-48, 2) and elsewhere<sup>68</sup>: The Buddha raises very early in the morning, and, after attending to his personal hygiene, begins his tour to beg for alms, which, as a matter of course, is accompanied by all sorts of miracles: All roads are suddenly smooth and free from any holes, the wind blows gently and scatters flowers on his way. Of course the laymen shower gifts upon the Buddha and his disciples. After returning to his monastery and eating his meal in the company of monks, the Buddha instructs monks in matters of the *dhmma* and assigns objects of meditation to individual monks according to their abilities before he retires for a while. If the Buddha wishes to do so, he lies down on one side like a lion to have a short rest: Even Buddhas need sleep occasionally. After having rested the Buddha is ready to receive the numerous visitors, monks and laymen alike. Finally, the time for a bath arrives. Before the Buddha retires very late in the evening, he walks up and down for a short time to relax after the long hours of sitting and teaching. This is really a long and demanding daily routine!

This was the model every individual monk had before his eyes. How far he could or did try to follow this model, is difficult to estimate given the scanty evidence offered, e.g., by Yi-jing for Nālandā. First, Yi-jing points out the impressive number of monks living at Nālandā. They can use three hundred rooms and eight assembly halls, which are at the disposal of about three thousand monks. Because this enormous number does not permit all monks to assemble in one place, one particular monk circulates from assembly hall to assembly hall to conduct recitations in honour of the Buddha. He is accompanied by laymen acting as his servants and by children carrying flowers<sup>69</sup>. This is an interesting remark, because it **proves the** presence of numerous laymen in a Buddhist monastery. This presence seems to be often overlooked or forgotten. For, when excavating dices occasionally in Buddhist monasteries, the archaeologists immediately see Buddhist

<sup>68</sup> For parallels see IIPL § 239.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. A Record of the Buddhist religion, as note 7 above, p. 154f.

monks indulging in gambling instead of spiritual progress. When dices came to light in different rooms at Nālandā, this was commented upon by J. A. Page, who conducted the excavations, by the following remark<sup>70</sup>: “[This] seems to suggest that Buddhist brethren in residence here, were not altogether above the amusements of less austere humanity.” Obviously, the very likely presence of laymen here did not even occur to Page for a moment. Remembering them, we could at least give the monks the benefit of doubt.

Further, Yi-jing reports that besides those monks joining the reciter in their praise and veneration of the Buddha, others worshipped the Buddha in private by meditating quietly in one of the many niches with Buddha images.

Nothing is said explicitly on the time during the day, when all this happened. Here, modern practices could be compared: Buddhist monks would rise early between about 04:00 and 05:00 in the morning and meet about 05:30 for first worship and meditation. The first meal is taken between 06:30 and 07:30. The time between 10:00 and 11:00 is reserved for taking a bath, and before noon the main meal of the day is eaten.

In this description, which follows the brief, but useful remarks by Dilip Kumar Barua<sup>71</sup> for modern practices, one thing is missing at this point. Begging for food is not mentioned. Of course this is still practiced every morning, however by no means by all monks. For, since many centuries, Buddhist monasteries are equipped with a kitchen. Again, Yi-jing pays due attention to the large refectories regularly furnished with a statue of Hārītī in Gandhāra. And he does not fail to mention the equally large kitchens.

The monks meet again in the evening for meditation and recitation before they retire by 10:00 at night. Meditation is and was of the utmost importance as a matter of course besides the worship of the Buddha as we read in old texts and observe it today. The numerous descriptions of meditation do not ignore the many obstacles met by monks trying to concentrate. The danger of falling asleep was always present, all the more so, as the time reserved for sleep was brief. It is therefore not at all surprising that Buddhist monks invented all sorts of devices to stay awake and to keep their brethren awake, from gently or not so gently kicking them with the knee, snapping the fingers, throwing small balls or even beating sleeping monks with a stick. This is done, however, as the text emphasises in a spirit of benevolent thought. For benevolence should be the guideline for the atmosphere in a Buddhist monastery<sup>72</sup>.

<sup>70</sup> Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of 1923/4. Calcutta 1926, p. 74.

<sup>71</sup> Monastic Life in Bangladesh. A case study. JIBS 48.2 [96]. 2000, p. 1127-1124; on the daily routine of Mūlasarvāstivāda monks cf. G. Schopen: Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries. On Calendars, Clocks, and Some Liturgical Practices, in: Śūryacandrāya. Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday. Indica et Tibetica 35. Swistal-Odendorf 1998, p. 157-179 = Buddhist Monks and Business Matters, as note 3 above, p. 260-284.

<sup>72</sup> Abhisamācārika-Dharmā. ed. by B. Jinananda. Patna 1969, p. 208 = Transcription of the Abhisamācārika-Dharma Chapter V-VII by the Abhisamācārika-Dharma Study Group, in: Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūsho Nenpō 21. 1999, p. (1)-(79): 234-156, particularly p. (58) 175f. (*attha mairīcittena yaṣṭhīlī cārayitavyā*, 208, 9 = (59) 176, 4f.). On the corresponding evidence in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya: 11.

It is possible only rarely to get a vague idea of how monks **really** behaved towards each other, when they were not occupied by religious duties of one sort or another. An extremely negative example during the time of the Buddha are the infamous Assajipunabbasuka monks living at Kiṭṭāgiri, who eat late in the evening, drink alcohol, dance and engage in all sorts of inappropriate behaviour (Vin II 9, 31-10, 16). Above all, they are notorious brutes (*caṇḍā te bhikkhū pharusā*), so much so that even Sāriputta and Moggallāna are afraid to intervene and are ready to reprimand them only after the Buddha dispatches a larger force of monks for their protection (Vin II 12, 30-37).

We are not told how the Assajipunabbasuka monks actually reacted when Sāriputta and Moggallāna arrived with all their army of monks. Of course an appropriate punishment according to the Vinaya was handed down to them. Besides formal exchanges of words as prescribed by the Vinaya in certain situations, we can listen only very rarely to monks not talking about legal or religious, but worldly matters. This is the case sometimes in the middle of highly technical discussions, when a humorous story is used to define truth and untruth. In the explanation of the first Pācittiya rule *sampajāñnamusāvāde pācittiyaṃ* "Consciously telling the untruth is an offence that entails expiation" (Vin IV 2, 14\*\*) some ironical jokes are used as examples to demonstrate the border line between truth and untruth in the Samantapāsādikā:

*yo pana sāmaṇerena api 'bhante mayhaṃ upajjhāyaṃ passitthā' ti vutto keūiṃ kurumāno 'tava upajjhāyo dārusakaṭaṃ yojervā gato bhavissati' ti vā sigālasaddaṃ sutvā 'kassāyaṃ bhante saddo' ti vutto 'mātuyā te yānena gacchantiyā kaddame laggacakkaṃ uddharantānaṃ ayaṃ saddo' ti vā evaṃ neva davā na ravā aññaṃ bhaṇati, so āpattiṃ āpajjati yeva.*

*aññā pūraṇakathā nāma hoti: eko gāme thokaṃ telaṃ labbitvā vibhāraṃ āgato sāmaṇeraṃ bhaṇati 'tvaṃ ajja kuhiṃ gato? gāmo ekatelo abosī' ti vā pacchikāya ṭhapitaṃ pūvakhaṇḍaṃ labbitvā 'ajja gāme pacchikāhi pūve cāresu' ti vā, ayaṃ musāvādo va hoti, Sp 737, 20-31, cf. Sv 72, 26-30*

"Who says playfully **without speaking** rashly after being asked by a novice 'Did you see my teacher?' 'Your teacher has **probably** yoked the cart for collecting wood' or, if after hearing the **howling** of hyenas 'What noise is this' 'This is the noise of those who are **pulling out** the wheel of the carriage in which your mother is travelling and which got stuck in the mud', commits an offence.

Something else is irony (*pūraṇakathā*)<sup>73</sup>: **One** (monk), who got very little oil

Hu-von Hinüber: Das Poṣadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādis. Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik. Monographie 13. Reinbek 1994, p. 276f.

<sup>73</sup> This technical term corresponds to irony. It is explained in the subcommentary to the Majjhimanikāya on *vutto va naṃ vadeyya*, M I 502, 24: *mayā vutto va hutvā apucchito va kathaṃ samuṭṭhāpetvā ambajambuāḍiṇi gahetvā apūrayamāno mayā katthitaniyāmena bhavaṃ Bhāradvājo vadeyya*, Ps III 212, 9-12 "the venerable Bhāradvāja should speak exactly as being told by me in the same way as I did, even unasked after having begun a conversation and without filling it with mangos, jambu fruits etc.": *ambajambuāḍiṇi aññaṃaññavisadīsāni viya pūraṇakathānayaṃ yaṃ kiñci akathetvā*, Ps-pt III 104, 29f. "not **telling anything** in the way of irony as like mangos, jambu fruits etc., which are different from each other". *A pūraṇakathā* is "a speech, which has to be filled" by a thought or statement opposite to or different from what has **been**

in the village returns to the monastery and says to a novice ‘Where did you go (to beg for food)? The village is flooded with oil’ or, after getting a piece of a cake that was stored in a basket ‘Today they carry cakes around in baskets in the village’ — this is the untruth”.

Obviously, all these statements are not entirely true and consequently humour of this kind was thought to be inappropriate for Buddhist monks. These harmless jokes are of particular value also, because it is mostly extremely difficult to guess, what was felt to be humorous or hilarious in ancient texts such as the Buddhist canon or its commentaries, which were both composed in a cultural environment largely lost to us. Consequently, many paragraphs which we are inclined to read with a smile today, may have been a deadly serious matter to those, who originally wrote them down. Concerning the paragraphs quoted, the humorous meaning is guaranteed by the remark in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* that the monk who has received very little oil speaks *bassādbippāyena*, Sv 72, 27 “with the intention to joke” and by *keḷiṃ kurumāno*, Sp 737, 21 “playfully”.

Usually, this precious information is contained in very short paragraphs, if not single sentences embedded in virtually hundreds pages of sometimes complicated, if not deadly (at least to us) boring matter. However, all of a sudden a light flashes to illuminate for a brief moment the daily life in ancient India in the middle of elaborate theories on religion, philosophy or law. Therefore, these tiny bits of information are always in danger of being simply overlooked. Although they do certainly not promote the understanding of Buddhism as a religion or philosophy, they do help, however, understand those men and women as human beings, who kept Buddhism alive for so many centuries and much longer than even the Buddha himself anticipated, when he predicted the end of his teaching already after five hundred years (Vin II 256, 15). If Buddhism is still alive today in spite of this prediction, this is certainly the merit of those men who were attracted again and again to the life as a monk, if only because good live and salvation are so near to each other in Buddhism.

---

said. This term has not been observed so far outside the Theravāda Aṭṭhakathā, it seems. In Sanskrit poetics, *vyājastuti* or *leśa* seem to be the terms nearest to irony: Gero Jenner: Die poetischen Figuren der Inder von Bhāmaha bis Mammaṭa. Ihre Eigenart im Verhältnis zu den Figuren repräsentativer antiker Rhetoriker. Diss. Hamburg 1968, p. 82f. Mangos and jambu fruits not only look very different. Moreover, mangos are sweet and jambu fruits are sour.

## Bibliography

- Abhisamacārika-Dharmāḥ ed. by B. Jinananda. Patna 1969 / 'Transcription of the Abhisamacārika-Dharma Chapter V-VII by the Abhisamacārika-Dharma Study Group, in: Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūsho Nenpō 21. 1999, p. (1) – (79): 234-156
- Balbir, N.: *Lā-* et *Luñ-* en moyen-indien: emplois technique e morphologie, in: *Langue, style et structure dans le monde indien. Centenaire de Louis Renou.* Paris 1996, p. 327-352
- Barua, D. K.: Monastic Life in Bangladesh. A case study. *JIBS* 48.2 [96]. 2000, p. 1127-1124
- Bechert, H.: Die Datierung des historischen Buddha. *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Dritte Folge* I (Nr. 189, 1991), II (Nr. 194, 1992), III (Nr. 222, 1997)
- Beal, S.: *Hsuan-tsang: Si-yu-ki: Buddhist records of the western world.* Translated from the Chinese of Hsuen Tsiang (AD 629), 2 Bände. London 1884
- Burrow, T.: *A Translation of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan.* London 1940
- Coomaraswamy, A. K.: *La sculpture de Bharhut.* Annales du Musée Guimet. Bibliothèque d'art. Nouvelle série: VI. Paris 1956, planche XXVI, fig. 67
- Deeg, M.: Das Ende des Dharma und die Ankunft des Maitreya. End- und Neue-Zeit-Vorstellungen im Buddhismus mit einem Exkurs zur Kāśyapa-Legende. *ZfR* 7. 1999, p. 145-169
- Granoff, Ph.: Portraits, Likenesses and Looking Glasses: Some Literary and Philosophical Reflections on Representation and Art in Medieval India, in: *Representation in Religion* ed. by J. Assmann and A. I. Baumgarten. *Numen Book Series. Studies in the History of Religions* Vol. LXXXIX. Leiden 2001, p. 63-105
- Grierson, G. A.: *Bihar Peasant Life.* Patna 1926
- Hinüber, O. v.: Eine Karmavācānā-Sammlung aus Gilgit. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 119. 1969, p. 102-132
- : Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit, in: *Dialectes dans les Littératures Indo-Aryennes*, ed. par C. Caillat. Paris 1989, p. 341-367
- : Der Beginn der Schrift und frühe Schriftlichkeit in Indien. *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse*, Jg 1989, Nr. 11
- : Sprachentwicklung und Kulturgeschichte. Ein Beitrag zur materiellen Kultur des buddhistischen Klosterlebens. *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse*, Jg 1992, Nr. 6
- : Old age and old monks in Pāli Buddhism, in: *Aging. Asian Concepts and Experiences Past and Present*, edited by Susanne Formanek and Sepp Linhart. *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte* 643. Band, Wien 1997, p. 65-78
- : Das Pātimokkhasutta — Seine Gestalt und seine Entstehungsgeschichte. (Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus II). *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse*, Jg 1999, Nr. 6
- : Die Palola Śāhis. Ihre Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzzauber. *Materialien zur Geschichte von Gilgit und Chilas. Antiquities of Northern Pakistan. Reports and Studies* Vol. 5. Mainz 2004
- : Rev. of M. Njammasch: Bauern, Buddhisten und Brahmanen. 2001. *IJ* 47. 2004 [2006], p. 308-320
- Hu-von Hinüber, H.: *Das Posadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins.* Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik. Monographie 13. Reinbek 1994
- I-tsing: *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671-695)* trsl. by J. Takakusu. London 1896
- Jenner, G.: *Die poetischen Figuren der Inder von Bhāmaha bis Mammaṭa. Ihre Eigenart im Verhältnis zu den Figuren repräsentativer antiker Rhetoriker.* Diss. Hamburg 1968

- Kaimal, Padma: The problem of portrait in South India ca. 970-1000 A.D. *Artibus Asiae* 59. 1999, p. 59-133; 60. 2000, p. 139-179
- Lockwood, M., A. Vishnu Bhatt: *Metatheater and Sanskrit Drama*. Delhi 1994
- Lüders, H.: *Bharhut Inscriptions*, revised by E. Waldschmidt and M. A. Mehendale. *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum* Vol. II, 2. Ootacamund 1963
- Ramachandran, T. N.: An inscribed Bodhisattva image from Mathura. *Ancient India* 6. 1950. p. 100-102, plates XXXVIII, XXXIX
- Rau, W.: The vagrant and the poor in Sanskrit poetry. *ABORI* 72/73. 1991 & 1992, p. 23-34
- Ray, R. A.: Nāgārjuna's Longevity, in: J. Schober [Ed.]: *Sacred Biography in the Buddhist Traditions of South and Southeast Asia*. Honolulu 1997, p. 129-159
- Sankalia, H. D.: *The Nālandā University*. Delhi<sup>2</sup> 1972
- Schlingloff, D.: *Ajanta. Handbuch der Malereien. I: Erzählende Wandmalereien* Vol. II. Supplement. Wiesbaden 2000
- Schopen, G.: *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks. Collected Papers on the Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu 1997
- : *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters. Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu 2004
- : *Figments and Fragments of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India. More collected Papers*. Honolulu 2005
- Schubring, W.: *Die Lehre der Jainas nach den alten Quellen dargestellt*. Berlin und Leipzig 1935
- Seidel A.: Den'e, in: *Hōbōgirin* VIII. 2003
- Silk, J.: Dressed for Success. The Monk Kāśyapa and Strategies of Legitimation in **Earlier Mahāyāna** Buddhist Scriptures. *JAs* 291. 2003, p. 173-219
- : *Managing Monks. Administration and Administrative Roles in Ancient Indian Buddhist Monasticism*.
- Spink, W.: The Innocent Evolution of Ajanta's technology. In: H. Bakker [Ed.]: *The Vākāṭaka Heritage. Indian Culture at the Crossroads*. Groningen 2004, p. 87-105
- Turner, R. L.: *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London 1968
- Watt, G.: *The Commercial Products of India Being an Abridgment of "The Dictionary of the Economic Products of India"*. London 1908
- Wezler, A.: Zur Proklamation religiös-weltanschaulicher Toleranz bei dem indischen Philosophen Jayantabhaṭṭa. *Saeculum* 27. 1976, p. 329-347